In today's industrial age man has surrendered his privacy for technology. He dwells in luxurious apartments with paper thin walls. When he shall, he is observed by hidden cameras. Doctors have his health records on file and schools list his academic achievements and his intelligence quotient. Credit card companies have a detailed account about his income and financial status. If he has served in the military, the government knows about his political affiliations. The FBI probably has his fingerprints and photograph if he has committed a felony.

Possibly man's privacy may be even more threatened. In the 1970 census, U.S. citizens will have to answer certain questions about their incomes or jobs or face the prospect of a $100 fine or 60 days in jail. The federal government may establish a National Data center which would contain facts about people compiled by such agencies as the FBI. Congress has appropriated funds to set up a similar version of it in some of the states; for example, in California, all state records about welfare, medical care, employment and rehabilitation will be computerized by 1975. Insurance companies are following a similar approach.

Man's privacy is a right that helps him to maintain his individuality. Political scientist Alan F. Westin defines privacy as the right to determine what information about ourselves we will share with others. He feels that if man cannot control what is known about him, he will lose his freedom to himself.

To complicate the problem, man is acquiring the tools to reveal his personal life. More emphasis is placed on man sharing communal experiences. Private confession in the Catholic Church is falling into disuse. Psychic patients discuss their problems amidst group therapy.

What will result if man has no privacy? Computers may compile facts about himself which he may not know—information in access to everyone. If man had made mistakes in the past, it will be harder for him to start a new future. Then the date may be misinformed. Man may be afraid to state his opinion for fear of punishment.
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SPORTS

INTRAMURAL BASKETBALL—This week brings to an end another exciting intramural basketball season. The playoff games for the school championship will be played the weekend of February 21. Each of the leagues have an unchallenged leader with all three league leaders.
showing a four win and 0 loss record. Unless there is an upset this weekend, the Gods of Hell Fire, Roger's Boozers, and the UBI team will compete for the championship and the trophies which are presented to the victor on Field Day at the end of the school year. No speculations on the big game will be made until this Sunday's games are over.

SWIMMING—Several students have commented that they have observed students going to the library in great numbers, but none of them seem to be carrying any books. When these same students are seen leaving the library they seem to be wet, tired, but content. When we investigated this situation, it seems that some of the Marian students have discovered that there is an inside swimming pool in the basement of the library, open at convenient hours for the students. So, whenever studying becomes a bore and you think you would like to meet some cool kids, slip on a suit (no tie required) and come see us. I'm sure you will enjoy yourself.

Baseball—Baseball is a game which utilizes gloves (not like boxing gloves), bats (not like those that fly overhead at night) home runs (not like a Marian coed becoming homesick) and skill (not like Marian has ever seen before). Last year Marian recruited several outstanding freshmen baseball players in Mike Brunette and Larry Unser, and Richard Geaither. With a few upperclassmen back and several freshmen prospects looking good again this year, skill will not be one of Marian's downfalls. Coach Harkin feels that his team this year will be even stronger than last. Last year Marian defeated such baseball powers as Ball State and U. of Louisville. This year the boys will be making a long promised trip South. Coach Harkin hopes that he can soon start practicing hitting outside so to be ready for the Southern teams.

The Sixties—Foundation for a Future?

The past decade brought with it a wave of political interest among the youth of our country. In vivid contrast to their bopping brothers and sisters of the fifties young people nurtured and cherished an idealism that green grass and smiling people were not confined to fairy tales. Just dreams despite childhood realisms of foul air, water too dirty to swim in and a troutless river. In vivid contrast to their bopping tactics, "the movement," was an idealism of their offspring. Coach Harkin feels that his team this year will be stronger than last. Last year Marian defeated such baseball powers as Ball State and U. of Louisville. This year the boys will be making a long promised trip South. Coach Harkin hopes that he can soon start practicing hitting outside so to be ready for the Southern teams.

By 1967 campus turmoil made frequent headlines and riot season in the ghettos ran from June to August. Militancy seemed the only way to change a nation which confronted its youth with clubs. A country which could no longer manufacture happy niggers, nuclear weapons, dirty water and double standards without cracking a few heads in the process. What they considered a hopeless battle against parents who raised them, business which paid them, and the army which laid them out. Drugs and sex replaced traditional norms and values for some, which in the process received more publicity than any one constructive attempt by youth in achieving reform. It seemed a better idea to drop acid in the classroom than stir bathtub gin like their parents to escape from society's problems... one of the dangers of an education.

Others reacted by affiliating themselves with another extreme, the Y.A.F., and the masses of patriots were relieved in finding that there was still some sanity among youth. The hillbilly monarch, George McGovern, coined the slogan, "I hobo- lied before I was a virgin" for white supremacy to lead the patriots in a call for law and order to rid the country of dissent. It seems unfortunate that George and the Y.A.F. didn't experiment with drugs, at least then we could pinpoint their problem as one ofillusion rather than disillusion.

Many students saw an opportunity to achieve peaceful reform under "clean" Gene McCarthy in his anti-war presidential campaign of 1968. Enthusiasm and determination among youth were characteristic of the campaigns of McCarthy and his liberal rival, Robert Kennedy. Victories were abundant in the state primaries and the American political system began to traverse a viable, responsible institution. Idealistic dreams were short-lived however, with their death certificates signed on a balcony in Memphis, the floor of a hotel kitchen in Los Angeles, and in the tear-gas filled streets of Chicago. A decade of frustration had prevailed.

What can follow a decade which began with the inauguration of J.F.K. and ended with the wedding of Tiny Tim? L.B.J. has been replaced by the doomsday twins—Tyraannus Nix and Spirial. Intellectual dissidents are now known as "effete snobs. The Cuyahoga River has been proclaimed a fire hazard. Governor Rhodes of Ohio (home of the Cuyahoga River) claims that the liberal arts student is the type of intellectual who is hopelessly perverted, and advocates that all schools change into technical trade oriented colleges. We have allocated billions toward development of an A.M. system which has recently been called the obsoletistrike capabilities of M.I.R.V. This is obviously not the dawn of the Age of Aquarius.

If the system listens and proves itself to be a relevant rather than a reactionary structure, then peace may yet prevail. If not, the forces of law and order will continue to deal with the young, the blacks, and other citizens as second-class citizens. We shall then face the ultimate decision of either rotting to death on the largest pile of garbage in the universe or rising toward the stars on a mushroom cloud. Welcome the 70's...
We the editors of the CARBON in consideration of existing circumstances and the resulting implications defer this editorial space to Russell Margus. We fully support and agree with the contents. We also take responsibility for the publication of this necessary and important letter.

We hope students, faculty and administrators will suspend prior considerations of the CARBON and READ this issue in its entirety.

John K. Mahoney
Co-Editor

Michael Miller
Co-Editor
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PAST COLLEAGUE ADDRESSES PHOENIX EDITORIAL

Dear Editors,

In the last issue of the Phoenix an editorial publicly raised issues which have been troubling many of us for some time. The students as well as the religious and lay faculty, and the Board of Trustees have a right to know the facts. Furthermore, the men responsible for this travesty should know that they can no longer exercise their authority in an arbitrary fashion.

The essential fact of the Pedtke case is this: William Pedtke has been the victim of systematic and unrelenting harrassment by Dr. Guzzetta. This affair did not, official statements notwithstanding, begin with Dr. Kraus' negative recommendation concerning Mr. Pedtke's tenure. Rather, Dr. Guzzetta has attempted to intimidate Mr. Pedtke for his involvements outside of his role as an assistant professor of philosophy.

First, Dr. Guzzetta charged Mr. Pedtke with academic incompetence, then he shifted the charge to professional incompetence because the former claim could not be substantiated.

Dr. Guzzetta's disenchancement with Mr. Pedtke stems from the latter's involvement as advisor to the B.I.L., his activities in behalf of Operation Upbeat, his defense of students appearing before the student disciplinary board, and finally his rescheduling of classes in observation of the Octo-er Vietnam moratorium. These reasons manifested to Dr. Guzzetta unprofessionalism warranting dismissal.

Both the students' rights and the framework within which they are expected to function are being threatened here. What is the benefit to the student of having the right to be defended before the discipline or mittee by an articulate spokesman, if a faculty member must jeopardize his job in doing so. What kind of hypocrisy is involved in an administrative demand that student organizations have faculty advisors if those advisors must risk their jobs in that service?

In the last few months, there have been several overt violations of Faculty Policy in the case of Mr. Pedtke's tenure:

A.) According to Policy, "If the college does not wish to renew the contract or wishes to change in any way the status of the College will so advise the faculty member at the beginning of January." (p. 25 of Faculty Handbook); yet the terms of tenure and dismissal will be the terms of A.A.U.P.'s (American Association of University Professors) 1940 Statement of Principles,

B.) Faculty policy also states that "A Board of Appeals will be established to review faculty cases of termination for cause of a continuous appointment (tenure) or the dismissal of a teacher previous to the expiration of a term appointment. In all cases where facts are in dispute, the accused faculty member should be informed before the hearing in writing of the charges against him and he should have the opportunity to be heard in his own defense by all bodies that pass judgment upon his case. Recommendations of this Board of Appeals are submitted to the President who in turn will transmit the same to the Board of Trustees for final action."

"In other instances such as dismissal prior to tenure and grievances relating to promotion, tenure or other related matters which cannot be resolved through the departmental chairman and Dean of Academic Affairs, the faculty member concerned may submit his grievance to the Board of Appeals who in turn will hear the case and recommend a course of action to the President. Generally, no action will be taken without the concurrence of the departmental chairman, the Dean of Academic Affairs and the President." (p. 27 of Faculty Handbook)

Mr. Pedtke, having all the same rights as a tenured person according to the 1940 A.A.U.P. statement on tenure, and faculty policy which adopted the 1940 A.A.U.P. statement on tenure, received no formal written grievance to act upon in convening the Board of Appeals.

Mr. Pedtke was merely advised by Dr. Guzzetta that he had received conflicting recommendations for tenure, Dr. Kraus, the Chairman of the department, had submitted a negative recommendation and S. Adele, the Academic Dean, had recommended that Mr. Pedtke be given tenure.

It is Marian College policy that cause (specifically moral turpitude, academic or professional incompetence) must be shown to dismiss a faculty member (according to the 1940 A.A.U.P. statement on tenure, faculty policy which adopted this statement and according to Dr. Guzzetta on Dec. 13, 1969, to what he called the 'Black Friday-Group' of nineteen faculty members); and no cause (continued page 4)
has been formally produced to satisfy these policy requirements on tenure. It is policy and tradition that such procedures include the Academic Dean, Sr. Adele's whole position of authority in our college community has been undermined. She was neither directly advised nor consulted concerning this issue; and when she volunteered her professional opinion it was summarily disregarded. This serious charge manifests not merely a naive failure to communicate but rather a deliberate attempt to subvert the strength of her office by Dr. Guzzetta.

It seems clear that Dr. Kraus, as chairman of the philosophy department, initiated a cogent recommendation for Mr. Pedtke's dismissal, due to several factors:

A.) Dr. Kraus had only worked with Mr. Pedtke for not even four months before he initiated his recommendation for dismissal on Jan. 2, 1970.

B.) In doing so Dr. Kraus acted contrary to the following:

1.) A favorable recommendation by Msgr. John J. Doyle, chairman of the philosophy department when Mr. Pedtke was hired and for the first four years of Mr. Pedtke's service at Marian.

2.) A favorable recommendation by Sr. Adele, who was Academic Dean when Mr. Pedtke was hired and has had five years to evaluate his performance at Marian.

3.) Favorable recommendations by all members of the Philosophy Department - Denis Kelly, who worked with Mr. Pedtke for four years, myself, who has worked with Mr. Pedtke for four years, and David White, who has worked with Mr. Pedtke for two years.

4.) Favorable recommendations by a number of Mr. Pedtke's graduate professors at both Notre Dame and Purdue Universities, including a member of Mr. Pedtke's MA Comprehensive Board at N.D., the chairman of the philosophy department at Purdue and the Director of Graduate Studies at Purdue's Graduate School of Philosophy. These are among those testifying in writing to Mr. Pedtke's abilities.

5.) Favorable recommendations by all of the present senior philosophy majors at this college as well as Mr. Giff Ring, a Woodrow Wilson fellowship winner in philosophy and an alumnus of Marian.

6.) Favorable recommendations in the form of faculty evaluation questionnaires submitted to students in Mr. Pedtke's classes.

C.) When Dr. Kraus was apprised of all the favorable written evidence for Mr. Pedtke, Dr. Kraus still did not reverse his negative recommendation.

D.) Dr. Kraus, in spite of the Academic Dean's formal presentation of evidence which categorically refuted his allegations against Mr. Pedtke persisted in keeping to his own undocumented judgment.

E.) Dr. Kraus told Sr. Adele that he "would only pay attention to those who mattered i.e., the President and the Dean and that if he had not been well paid he would have fired and fired." 

F.) Dr. Kraus has never observed Mr. Pedtke's classroom procedure and therefore had no direct evidence of academic incompetence.

It seems clear that unless he had already formed a negative opinion regarding Mr. Pedtke's tenure, Dr. Guzzetta would have seriously questioned Dr. Kraus' recommendations for dismissal.

If it is true that Dr. Guzzetta has been acting in a detached and neutral manner solely on the recommendation of a departmental chairman, whose own academic competence is at best questionable, why did Dr. Guzzetta lay his letter of resignation on the table at the January Board of Trustees meeting over this issue?

In addition it should be known that the entire philosophy department recommended to Dr. Guzzetta that Dr. Kraus' contract not be renewed on the basis of professional incompetence. Moreover, we advised him that on the basis of student complaints, his academic competence was doubtful. Subsequent to this meeting, Dr. Guzzetta submitted to a contract for Dr. Kraus which included the largest salary increase of any faculty member. It might be added here that as a matter of College policy it is the Academic Dean who evaluates and recommends departmental chairman.

Sr. Adele returned Dr. Kraus' contract to Dr. Guzzetta without her signature of endorsement.

Manifiestly, Dr. Guzzetta is of the opinion that he can administer an institution of higher learning without regard for the academic competence of its faculty. It would be no surprise if Marian's next example of administrative malfeasance would involve an attempt to remove the unquestionably qualified Academic Dean of this institution. I say this because next to Pedtke, Sr. Adele has been subjected to more abuse than anyone else involved in this affair.

As an administrator she was forced to choose between expedience and Christian ethics when she received Dr. Kraus' negative recommendation of Mr. Pedtke. Her's was the tremendous responsibility of either endorsing a recommendation which she knew was supported by subterfuge, in order to preserve the tranquility and unity of the college, or, because of her personal integrity as well as her professional competence, telling the truth.

I want it known by everyone that Sr. Adele has not objected because of obstinance, a personality conflict, or a negative attitude. To the contrary, she has represented the College that Dr. Kraus' contract not be renewed on the basis of professional incompetence - the courage and integrity man has admired since he became moral - the courage to do the right thing in a society which rewards the opposite. This stand is particularly meaningful today considering the justifiable claim by many of the country's college students that the older generation is guilty of hypocrisy, inauthenticity and unprincipled action.

It is no longer reasonable to minimize the significance of this particular incident. This issue, because of the way it has been prosecuted and the reasons supporting it, clearly transcends the fate of one faculty member. The whole future of Marian College depends on this single case. I am not here just speaking of physical survival but also of psychological and (continued page 5)
intellectual survival. The religious community of this college cannot remain in the cave—if you allow tyranny to reign for the sake of survival, then indeed you merit everything that occurs. And if the faculty at large defers to the power of one man, then the future working conditions at this institution are truly deserved. The potential damage to you students, the people for whom the college exists, is rapidly becoming clear. I suggest that in an environment in which one portion of the community earns its livelihood by being enlightened and another pays for the development of its intellectual powers, intentionally remaining in the security and darkness of the cave cannot be justified.

Visions and Christianity dictate justice. I sincerely hope that all members of this community will set aside our preoccupations and preconceptions and address ourselves to this issue. Let us come together—all we have to lose is our claims; all we have to gain is the right to call ourselves a Christian, academic community.

Russell Hargus
Asst. Prof. of Phil.

P.S. "And now, O men who have condemned me, I would fain prophesy to you; for I am about to die, and in the hour of death men are gifted with prophetic power. And I prophesy to you who are my murderers, that immediately after my departure punishment far heavier than you have inflicted on me will surely await you. He you have killed because you wanted to escape the accuser and not to give an account of your lives. But that will not be as you suppose; far otherwise. For I say that there will be more accusers of you than there are now; accusers whom hitherto I have restrained: and as they are younger they will be more inconsiderate with you, and you will be more offended at them. If you think that by killing men you can prevent someone from censuring your evil lives, you are mistaken; that is not a way of escape which is either possible or honorable; the easiest and the noblest way is not to disable others, but to be improving yourselves. This is the prophecy which I utter before my departure to the judges who have condemned me."

These are the words of Socrates to the Athenian court—the charge: "Socrates is a doer of evil who corrupts the youth; and who does not believe in the Gods of the state, but has other new divinities of his own."